

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,720	12/29/2000	John S. Rhoades	99-039-TAP	9219
7590 03/07/2005			EXAMINER	
Wayne P. Bailey			COLIN, CARL G	
Storage Technology Corporation One StorageTek Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	Louisville, CO 80028-4309		2136	
			DATE MAILED: 03/07/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/751,720	RHOADES, JOHN S.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Carl Colin	2136	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>2/22/2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal
was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling
the non-allowable claim(s).
7. Solution for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-30</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (see note below).
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
13. Other:

Regarding claim 1, Munro disloses transferring a selected tape catridge library module from one automated library module to which it is stored to another automated library module as specified in the office action for example (column 3, lines 5-12). Therefore, the transfer from one data storage unit to a second data storage unit is disclosed. Applicant argues that Munro does not disclose receiving request for a second data storage unit. Munro discloses in column 5, lines 15-40, requests for tape catridge and further discloses that tape catridges can be retrieved from one library module to another (column 5, lines 40 et seq.). Regarding claim 30, the invention disclosed by Munro contains plurality of automated systems connected with plurality of library modules and host computers "but only two computers and a single multimodule automated library system are illustrated for simplicity" (column 4, lines 34-67) and systems of controlled elements connecting library modules and hosts. In addition, claim 30 contains similar limitation to claim 1 which is discussed above and claim 30 claims an apparatus comprising a controller and a transportation device. Claims 1 and 30 are not in condition for allowance for at least the reasons cited above and the reasons cited in the office actions. Other independent claims recite similar limitations to claim 1 and the rest of the claims are directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons cited above and in the office action, a request for consideration has been considered, but does not place the application in condition for allowance. The claims are anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art of record either alone or combined.

BREGORY MORSE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY DENTER 2100